

**From:** David Union  
**To:** Microsoft ATR  
**Date:** 1/23/02 11:24pm  
**Subject:** Microsoft Settlement

I am one of the voices that is for stopping the case against microsoft as it's currently being carried on.

What microsoft \*DID\* do wrong is trying to force vendors to not carry other Operating Systems by offering them decreased prices for not offering options, sometimes disguising this as making them pay by the PC's they sold, not by the ones they sold with a MS Operating system.

This should be addressed as anti-competitive and the judge should let the companies effected by this, that had an alternate for the relevant hardware, perhaps sue for damages.

The bundling issue is completely bogus, and fabricated by competitors hoping to use the case to aid them in their business rivalry against a more well run competitor.

Microsoft is \*not\* known for innovation. Most of the stuff they 'bundled' they in fact did so in response to their competition doing it first.

I can do this case by case

- Disk Compression: DR Dos added it, Microsoft Followed
- Networking: Novel DOS added it, Microsoft Followed.  
Most UNIX operating systems had this first, including some by SUN, one of the people trying to testify against MS
- Internet Browsers: Many people had this before Microsoft
- Mice - Xerox had this first
- GUI - Xerox had this first, and GEOS had it first on the PC.
- CD Burning Software - MAC OS 'bundled' this first
- Video Editing - MAC OS 'bundled' this first
- Built in graphics printer drivers - this was also an 'add-on', but the 'MAC' OS bundled this first.
- Multiple Monitor Support - MAC OS 'Bundled' this first.
- Encryption/Security - SUN OS 'Bundled' that first
- Clustering - Many people 'bundled' that first
- FTP - All UNIX OS's 'bundled' this first
- Telnet - All UNIX OS's bundled this first

I could go on for pages.

In all cases there were 'stand-alone' products that had these features that were 'bundled' by the other OS before microsoft thought of it. They did it because their competitors did, to keep

up with them.

All of this is also just the natural extension of an OS (operating system). First you talk to some types of hardware, and as more becomes 'cheap' you arrange to talk to it, including network drivers, cards, wireless stuff, etc. You keep adding features to give people reasons to buy the new version, otherwise they won't - just like with cars or any other consumer product.

Also, Microsoft helped the industry in other ways, basically democratizing it. In the 80's, before Microsoft, just a word processor (Word Perfect, #1 at the time) was nearly \$500.

Adjust that for inflation, and see what you get for the same money today. Compare the cost of 'Lotus 123' in real dollars then and a whole office suite now. Microsoft's strong place has led to a huge upswell in the market. If there wasn't one really big market that developers could write for they never would have gotten the volume up to get the prices down, in real dollars, to where they are today.

Especially when at the time folks like Novell, IBM, SUN, DEC, and all the folks wining now were charging thousands of dollars (sometimes hundreds of thousands of dollars) for the 'privilege' of getting the tools to develop for their proprietary platform.

Look Microsoft is no saint. They decide all issues based on how much money it will cost or make. I've worked with projects and been told by SUN that they won't give us any information on their products because we (at the time I was a contractor working for another storage company) were a potential competitor. Is this not worse than Microsoft?

I was on another project - we were building a server. Intel was one of the main competitors. They bought out in a single month the chipset provider and memory provider, then jacked the prices up of the parts we'd need (and put delivery schedules on hold) killing the whole idea of competing with them.

Is that not worse than Microsoft?

I could go on and on, but all the folks complaining against Microsoft are the pot calling the kettle black.

Let people on a case-by-case sue for damages

on the bundling issue and drop the rest of the case and save we tax-payers all the expense of the case.

Hurting Microsoft hurts the Software industry as a whole, which is not something we need right now.

David Union  
Software Engineer  
Currently: Vibren Technology, Inc.

Former employee of of EMC Corp., and before that of Data General Corporation.

Long before Microsoft, IBM came to Data General, who had a DOS operating system, and asked to license it for use on their 'IBM PC'. Some "brilliant" marketing guy at the time said that "Data General wasn't a software company." I'll bet he regrets that one :)